

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated August 19, 2004, Claims 11, 15, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,077,896 (“Yano ‘896 Patent”). (8/19/04 Office Action, at page 2). The Examiner relies on the Yano ‘896 patent’s disclosure of use of reactive silane functional polyethers (“Kaneka MS”) in view of the methyl dimethoxysilane- functional polypropylene oxides disclosed in United States Patent No. 6,204,350 (“Liu ‘350 Patent”) to assert that Claim 11 of the current application would be anticipated by the repeating structural units of polymerized Kaneka MS. *See* 8/19/04 Office Action at page 2. The Examiner further asserts that calcium carbonate and titanium dioxide can be considered “thermally conductive” because all materials are somewhat thermally conductive. *Id.*

In addition, Claims 16-19, 22, and 23 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (Claim 11). The Examiner has indicated that Claims 16-19, 22, and 23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. (8/19/04 Office Action, at page 3).

In response, the applicants have cancelled Claims 1-15, 18, and 20-21. Claim 11 has been amended so as to incorporate the limitations of former dependent claims 15 and 16. Claim 17 has been rewritten in independent form, and has been amended so as to incorporate the limitations of previously-presented independent claim 11 and dependent claims 15 and 18. Claim 19 has been amended so as to depend from Claim 17. Claim 22 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of former Claim 22 and to depend from newly-independent Claim 23. Finally, Claim 23 has been rewritten in independent form and has been amended to incorporate the limitations of previously-presented Claim 11.

Additionally, Claim 17 has been amended so as to claim admixtures including graphite powder coated with nickel, silver, or gold, and thus electrically conductive. Support for this amendment is found at page 5, lines 14-29 and page 6, lines 5-11 of the application as filed. The prior art does not teach or suggest use of graphite admixture particles coated with nickel, silver, or gold, and thus electrically conductive.

In accordance with the Examiner's remarks in the 8/19/04 Office Action, the applicants respectfully submit that the cancellation of claims 15-16, 18, and 20-21, and the amendment of claims 11, 17, 19, 22 and 23 place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants note that Claim 11 has been amended so as to incorporate all of the limitations of dependent Claim 16, which stands objected. Claim 17 has been amended into dependent form so as to incorporate the limitations of previously-presented Claim 11, and to further claim the use of metal-coated graphite as an admixture material. Claim 19 has been amended to depend from amended Claim 17. Claim 23 has been amended into independent form to incorporate the limitations of previously-presented Claim 11. Finally, Claim 22 has been amended to depend from amended claim 23.

In view of these amendments Claims 11, 17, 19, 22, and 23 incorporate subject matter not obvious in view of prior art, and considered allowable by the Examiner. Claims 11, 17, 19, 22, and 23 are presented for continued examination. Allowance of Claims 11, 17, 19, 22, and 23 is respectfully requested.

Applicants do not believe that any additional fees are due other than the 2 month extension of time fee. However, if any additional fees are due, please charge such sums to our Deposit Account 50-1145.

Respectfully submitted,


Gerald Levy
Reg. No. 24,419

Lindsay S. Adams
Reg. No. 36,425

Attorney for Applicants

Pitney Hardin, LLP
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10036-7311